GOVERNMENT EXECUTIVE

MILITARY LEADERSHIP SERIES: NAVY

WELCOME:
ANDREA WHITE,
DIRECTOR OF EVENTS,
GOVERNMENT EXECUTIVE

TIMOTHY B. CLARK,
EDITOR IN CHIEF,
GOVERNMENT EXECUTIVE

MODERATED BY:
JAMES KITFIELD,
NATIONAL SECURITY CORRESPONDENT,
NATIONAL JOURNAL

SPEAKERS:
ADMIRAL GARY ROUGHEAD,
CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
U.S. NAVY

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2008

Transcript by
Federal News Service
Washington, D.C.

ANDREA WHITE: Good morning, everyone. Good morning. My name is Andrea White and I'm the director of events at Government Executive. Thank you for coming out this morning for what promises to be an interesting discussion with the Chief of Naval Operations.

Before I turn the program over to my colleague, Tim Clark, I have just a few brief announcements. First, I'd like to take a minute to recognize the sponsors of today's breakfast whose support helps make these events possible. We have five great companies here with us today, so if you'll bear with me for just a moment, I'd like to tell you a bit about each of them.

CA – CA software and expertise unify and simplify complex IT environments in a secure way across the enterprise for greater business results. They call this enterprise IT management, their clear vision for the future vision of IT. It's how you can manage systems, networks, security, storage, applications, and databases securely and dynamically. You can build on your own IT investments rather than replacing them and do so at your own pace.

Next we have Cisco. There are several representatives here today from Cisco. They brought along folders on your chairs which contain information about communications and collaboration solutions Cisco is able to deliver to our global maritime forces. I encourage you to take a look at their important data and use the letter in your packet to contact Cisco.

Next we have EDS, a leading global technology company who delivers a broad portfolio of information technology and business-processing outsourcing services to commercial and government clients around the world. You can learn more at eds.com.

Next we have Sodexo, a leading food and facilities-management company who aspires to improve the quality of daily life for the people they serve. The government-services division is proud to serve the Marine Corps and many federal agencies.

Last but not least, we have URS, one of the largest global integrated engineering, construction, and technical-services firms supporting the full project lifecycle with planning, design, environmental, program management, operations and maintenance services.

Next I'd like to remind everyone, if you've not already done so, to please turn off your cell phones or put them on vibrate mode. And, finally, at your chair, you'll find several items including the most recent issue of Government Executive, a subscriber form, if you don't already receive the magazine and an evaluation form for you to

provide us with feedback on the event. You can drop those off at the registration table on your way out.

With that said, I'd like to turn the program over to our editor in chief, Tim Clark, who will introduce our co-moderator and our featured speaker for today's event.

(Applause.)

TIMOTHY B. CLARK: Thank you very much, Andrea. And let me welcome all of you to the latest in our long-running leadership breakfast series. And let me say what a great privilege it is to be welcoming to the press club the 29th Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Gary Roughead. Welcome to you, sir.

Admiral Roughead is a 1973 graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy and he has held six operational commands in the U.S. Navy. He's one of only two officers to have commanded the fleets in the Pacific and in Atlantic, assuming responsibility for ensuring that Navy forces were ready and trained and equipped and prepared to operate around the world.

Significantly, I think, for today's discussion, he's deeply experienced in missile defense, having captained two Aegis ships, missile defense, area missile defense ships and we'll probably talk about that a little bit later today.

Ashore Admiral Roughead was commandant of the U.S. Naval Academy and was the Navy's chief of legislative affairs and a deputy commander of the U.S. Pacific Command. Now, of course, Admiral Roughead has responsibility for the health and readiness of one of America's greatest institution, one with a great, terrific, long and rich history. And he shouldered that burden just about exactly one year ago.

So, again, welcome, Admiral, and thank you for your service and for coming here to discuss the Navy with me and my colleague, James Kitfield, of National Journal and with our distinguished audience of federal officials. I might mention that in our company, we are all very proud of James because he has just won, just announced the Military Editors' and Reporters' Association 2007 excellence in overseas coverage award for his coverage of the Iraq surge.

So let's – Admiral Roughead has a number of awards, too, to numerous dimensions. (Laughter.) We probably don't have time for all of those. But I couldn't resist plugging my colleague, an old friend here, James Kitfield.

(Applause.)

In certain areas of our company, we call him General Kitfield because he's our senior military guy, but – (laughter) – I'm just a private. (Chuckles.) Let us start, Admiral Roughead, by asking you what new developments during your one-year tenure as CNO have posed the greatest challenges to the Navy?

ADMIRAL GARY ROUGHEAD: Well, I think in the years since I've been here as the CNO, as you read from my bio, from the operational standpoint, having commanded in the Pacific and in the Atlantic, I'm very comfortable operationally in what we have going on. So my focus really has been on what I consider to be the future Navy, building the Navy of tomorrow and coming back to Washington and addressing the challenges that we've faced there.

We – for the first time in a long time are, essentially, recapitalizing the Navy, if you will, in that every ship class that we have under construction today is almost a new start. We are in the beginning stages of the Virginia-class submarine, for example. And that has turned out extraordinarily well. The amphibious ship classes are relatively new, with the first one having just deployed new support ships and then some new combatant ships which are littoral combat ships and the DDG-1000, which I'm sure there will be a question or two on both of those as we get into it.

So a lot of it has had to deal with the future Navy. Aviation is no different. We have an aging maritime patrol fleet and we're recapitalizing that and building a new airplane to fill in there. And we're faced with, in the Navy, a strike fighter shortfall that begins in 2016 which will affect our ability to move our air wings around our aircraft carriers. So having to address those are not insignificant and that is where I have spent a lot of time.

As I talk about the Navy, I always talk in terms of three things I focus on: current operations, I mentioned that, future Navy and a Navy is nothing without people. So what are the policies and the plans that we have to attract, recruit and retain young men and women who want to serve in the Navy? And I would say it's not just those who want to serve in uniform. About 176,000 mean and women serve our Navy as Navy civilians. So those are areas that I've spent quite a bit of time on.

MR. CLARK: I think we want to get quickly to these important procurement and recapitalization questions, but, first, let me ask you, Admiral, if you would talk for a minute about what the sea services have called the new maritime strategy. I'm sure it was a product of many, many months of planning, but it was unveiled last October, just as you were taking office in your new job and it has some new areas of emphasis for the Navy, including, I believe, an emphasis on partnerships and on maritime security and on humanitarian relief and disaster response. And perhaps you could just tell us a little bit, give us a framework as to what that new maritime strategy encompasses in your mind.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Well, as you mentioned, the strategy really was about a year in the making. Not only did we engage within the Navy, the Marine Corps and Coast Guard, but we went out into America and we had what we call Conversations with the Country in several major cities around the nation: in Phoenix, for example; in San Francisco; Seattle, Miami to get a sense of what doing the country believe about its self as a maritime nation. What does it believe about its Navy, its Marine Corps, and its Coast Guard? And we brought all of that together among the three services to define

what we believe our future should be in the maritime domain. There was lively discussion, indeed, and many areas of debate within the Navy and the other services as to where do you come down? And, essentially, the debate really came down to, where is the balance point between what I would call the hard power and the soft power?

And the one thing that we agreed on is that, as a Navy, in particular, but the other services are also in agreement with this approach, is that we are not going to walk away from the traditional capabilities that have served our nation so well for 233 years. And that is to be a global Navy, to be out there, to be forward, to be able to respond with credible power that can serve as a deterrent force.

So being forward-deployed, being global, one capability that we affirm and then having the strength and the power to be a deterrent force. And that requires having the right types of things and having your people trained in the right way.

We also know that you have to be able to project power, project power from aircraft carriers, from ships and submarines, and from amphibious ships in the form of United States Marines. We also have to be able to control the seas and be able to ensure that we can move and gain access where we need to, when we need to.

But as we got into the maritime strategy, we realized that maritime security and the globalization that has taken place and the flows of commerce and resources on the oceans – 90 percent of anything that moves on the planet moves on the oceans – that we had to begin to think more globally and work in a more cooperative way with friends and partners and other organizations to have a better sense of that and to be able to provide for that safety and security that ultimately guarantees our prosperity and the prosperity of countries around the world.

But then there was an event that really shaped the development of it, and it was during my time in the Pacific when the tsunami of 2004 struck. And we put forth the most significant humanitarian-relief operation in history. And for our military, it was the largest ever, surpassed the Berlin Airlift, and it brought together nongovernmental organizations; it brought together about 22 different navies. And we were able to provide that relief in Indonesia, Thailand and Sri Lanka.

But when it was over, we looked at it and said, you know, we would be in a much better place if we could take some of this capability and be more proactive in our humanitarian activities. One, it would bring relief and benefit to people who would not normally see that type of care. But it would also serve as a vehicle to bring nongovernmental organizations closer to us, because when you go into a disaster, you have to be able to work well together.

It also is aimed at bringing other nations together so that we can operate more effectively so that when we do have to come together on short notice, you're not getting acquainted for the first time and you're not trying to work through some of the challenges that you have.

So that piece has found its way into the maritime strategy and I might add that it's not just a glossy book because, as we sit here today, the U.S.S. Kearsarge is off of Haiti providing relief to Haiti. The Nassau is off of our own country in Texas supporting the relief operation there. In recent months, we've brought together several ships in the vicinity of Burma; regrettably, that country would not allow that assistance to come to the aid of their people.

But we are mounting these operations in a proactive way. We've deployed our hospital ships, every year now, to different parts of the world as well as some of our large amphibious ships. So that's the strategy, in a nutshell.

We also made the decision – and this was another piece that was open to debate – that we are clear in saying that we're going to focus our effort really in the Western Pacific and in the Arabian Gulf/Indian Ocean region because we believe that's where our prosperity and our economy and economies of our allies are most effective.

So, you know, it has been well-received internationally and it has allowed us as we look at this future Navy, it has given us a framework to look at and to use it as a guide as we make investment decisions for the future.

MR. CLARK: Thank you. James.

JAMES KITFIELD: And one of the things you didn't mention, but in this sort of realm of counterinsurgency and winning hearts and minds, what we've seen is that when you do things like that, you know, the image of America goes up and it makes our diplomacy that much more powerful, which is a good thing.

Shifting to shipbuilding, which is probably a more contentious issue, I'm sure there's times in the last year you wish you were sailing with a battle group into hostile water rather than going up to Capitol Hill. But a lot of people have looked at the shipbuilding account and Navy shipbuilding and are quite worried. Recent CSIS reports, Center for Strategic and International Studies, said that it was in serious disarray and that the cost already is so high that the U.S. Navy has – is the greatest peacetime threat to the U.S. Navy right now.

We've seen this problem with the Coast Guard, too, so before I get to the specific programs, could you address to us why there seems to be so many problems with U.S. shipbuilding right now. Is the model fundamentally broken? Is Congress getting a little more stingy because of hard economic times and so some of the cost overruns are no longer palatable. Explain to us why in this time we are having so much problems with our shipbuilding.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: You know, and I would not say that Congress is getting more stingy. I mean, there are overruns. If you look at some of the overrun figures that have taken place on some of the ship classes, they are really extraordinary. And, you

know, as someone who is of the fleet and I have not spent that much time in Washington, I kind of view my Navy budget much the same way as I do my personal budget.

You know, I don't overdraw my personal budget. I like to make sure that as I plan my expenses, I'm going to be able to cover those. And I think that there are a couple of things that have come into play. In the case of one ship class in particular, LCS, we moved very, very fast with LCS. That's our littoral combat ship. And the norm is that it takes about, from concept to the first ship in the water and operational, 11 years is a good inside figure, but sometimes it takes about 14 years.

LCS that we accepted last week for the Navy, we did that in about five years. And so, there was a rush. We thought we could get by with some commercial specifications. As we got into the ship and building the ship and considering it, some of those commercial applications weren't going to do it from a survivability standpoint. So that required some recasting of specifications and then redesign.

We were building while we were still designing, which is not necessarily a good thing. In past years, we, in a drive to efficiency, had backed away or backed off some of the manning that we have in some of our technical areas and our oversight areas in the shipyards and that came back to bite us. So there were some issues there.

The other thing that I believe we have not done well is to be more exacting in how we set our requirements for the ships. When I came in and started reading some of the requirements documentation, there are some places you can drive a truck through. And people who are well-meaning, who are trying to do the right thing, who are trying to add as much capability to ships as they can, I think we added more than perhaps we needed. I think we added what we wanted.

I also think that it is very easy in the world that we live in today to become enamored with technology. I'm not a Luddite, but I think you have to be very clear in looking at technology and looking at technology and looking at the capabilities that you're trying to put into the fleet. And you can become somewhat drawn away by some of the higher technology. And you take your eye off what is it that we must give our sailors and Marines to go out and do their job. In trying to project, sometimes that crystal ball is quite murky, but trying to project what do you think you're going to need in the next 20, 30 years and I think we – sometimes we get pulled away and perhaps put too much more on than we haven't –

MR. KITFIELD: And I think that you mission was complicated by the procurement pause we took in the 1990s. So when you finally did get money, you had to move fastly. But a lot of the things you describe – gold-plating, adding on capabilities, concurrent design – we've learned from the past that these things are risky. What was the rush? What was the rush to do this?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: I think, particularly in the case of the littoral combat ship is that there are developing around the world and as our strategy points out, we will find

ourselves operating more in littorals and archipelagos. We did not have a ship that really was suited well to that. So we needed to address that gap.

The other thing we're dealing with is that I look at our fleet and there are two dimensions to it: There are the capabilities – what do we want that fleet to be able to do – and then there's the capacity, how much do you have to go off and do it. Right now, our fleet is at 282 ships. It's the smallest fleet that we've had in a long, long time. You have to go way back in history to find a fleet smaller than that. Our objective is to build to a minimum of 313 ships, but you have to have numbers in order to be present.

And when you are a global Navy, you have to have numbers that allow you to generate that presence. And you're going to need, depending on certain ship types, around four, you know, the way we phrase it, about four to make one because you have a ship in maintenance, you have ships in training, you have a ship that has just come back. And so capacity is very important and the littoral combat ship gives us that capacity and the capability that we need.

MR. KITFIELD: Okay, so I – and I'll leave littoral combat ship, but the first two vast cost overruns – I think almost 220 million to 500 million – the third was delayed, if not cancelled. Is that program operationally still sound, though? You are still full speed ahead? You want the 55 littoral combat ships?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Absolutely. We do. We had a very good trial with LCS-1. LCS-2 is being built down in Mobile, Alabama. They are two very different designs, but we need those ships. I'm committed to those ships and I'm very optimistic based on what we've seen out of the first one.

MR. KITFIELD: Okay, let's shift to a ship that you're not so committed to apparently, which is the DDG-1000 Zumwalt-class destroyer. This past summer, you did something I've never seen before, which is, a brand-new ship which is usually, the services, with a new weapons system, are just very anxious to get their hands on these things. The Navy, after taking two, gave testimony that maybe they didn't need this ship; maybe we need to go back to the Aegis, which has been so good, but which is also a veritable shift.

And then Congress got involved and it looks like you may be buying a third after all. Obviously, Congress has a hand to play in this. What happened?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Right. The – you know, as I told a lot of folks, and I've talked to a lot of folks since I made this decision, the easiest thing for me to have done would have been to do nothing. But as I began to get into the whole shipbuilding issue in the past year and I looked at what we believe in our strategy – the world that I have seen evolve in the naval context, and I started to dig into our shipbuilding program and look at the DDG-1000, DDG-1000 is a ship that has its genesis in the early '90s.

And I think all of us here would agree; the world has changed a little bit since the early '90s. We've seen proliferations of threats that did not exist before, ballistic missile defense being one of them. And I believe that ballistic missiles will, in the future, be weapons of intimidation and blackmail. You're seeing internationally more concern over being able to do something about ballistic missiles.

We're also seeing proliferation of advanced anti-ship missiles. And it goes beyond just the state-to-state proliferation. April of 2006 to me was a fairly significant month because it was then that Hezbollah, a terrorist organization, fired a sophisticated anti-ship missile at an Israeli ship operating off of the coast of Lebanon and almost sank it. This is not another country; this is a group that got their hands on that.

So our ability to be able to control the seas, to be able to go into areas, to be a deterrent force really requires an ability to go in and provide area defense not just for us but for other forces that may be operating there, for commerce that may be trying to move through those areas. And as I looked at the DDG-1000, it did not give us that capability. It gave us a long-range gun. To be sure, there's great technology on the DDG-1000. The program is well-run and so that's not the issue.

The real issue for me is capability. And when you are talking about buying a ship for a cost that will likely be right around $3 billion, to me we have to look at capability. The question then became one of, well, why did you do it when you did it? And the issue there was one of getting our 2010 budget moving forward to go before the Department of Defense and the Congress. And if we did not reset our shipbuilding plan then, then it would not have been possible to do that. So that's how we arrived at it.

We decided that the best approach was to truncate the program at two ships because we want to harvest the technology; we've invested a lot of money in the 1,000 program; there's no question about that. But we wanted to harvest that technology. There's a new hull design, there are new propulsion concepts. One of the things that's very important to me is we've invested heavily on reducing the manpower in that ship.

So I want to be able to make sure that we can harvest that technology because we're going to have to do that in future ships and even in our fleet in being we're going to have to go back and figure out a way to remove the number of people that it takes to operate our ships and we can come back around to that later.

So there are things that we want in that technology that we have to see. We moved forward, we had discussions with OSD. We then went up to the Hill and I'm not the type that's going to play cute and run around and try to spark some fires around my boss' back; that's not who I am. So we went through that process. We got up on the Hill, we had subsequent discussions.

As you may know, the 2009 budget is up there. There's a DDG-1000 in it. And after those discussions and for reasons of the industrial base, we said, let's just leave that as is. But we believe it's important to begin the process of restarting the DDG-51 line

again and I'm hopeful that there will be the funding in there to allow us to do that. Long answer, but that's where we are.

MR. KITFIELD: And just to get clear, you really – so you really want to make a transition back to the DDG-51 as the destroyer of the near to mid term and you don't want – beyond this third – if they sort of force you to buy the third, you don't want to go the way of the DDG-1000.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: I do not. And what we will be able to do is take the technology from the 1000, the capability and capacity – because we can build more 51s – and then that comes together around 2017 in a replacement ship for our cruisers. So we harvest both, put them together, learn from some pretty advanced technology. I mean, we've never seen this hull form at sea before. So we have to be able, I think – I don't think it will hurt us to assess these ships, see what we get out of them, and yet still build the capability that we're going to need to be forward in places that could get pretty sporty.

MR. CLARK: A couple of follow-up questions on the whole weapons business – the advanced anti-ship missiles – you cite the Hezbollah case – where are they coming from? Who is making them and how are these groups getting their hands on them? And do we have a defense against them in our – in the LCS and other close and littoral ships?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Obviously, there are missiles and proliferation that takes place country to country. There is little question in my mind that the missiles that Hezbollah is acquiring are coming out of Iran. And how those trades will continue to take place – I think proliferation is the way of the future.

That said, when I talk about the need to be able to provide this integrated air defense that is existent in our Aegis weapon system, I am very comfortable with our ability to provide air defense in areas in the literal – and to be able to support the other ships that may be operating there.

MR. CLARK: And so these advanced anti-ship missiles are launched through the air, not through the sea?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: No, they are launched – they can be launched in a variety of ways. In the case of Hezbollah, they were launched from the shore. They can be launched from submarines. They can be launched from other ships. They can be launched from airplanes.

MR. CLARK: Do we have adequate defenses against –

ADM. ROUGHEAD: I am comfortable with our fleet today.

MR. CLARK: Let me ask you another sort of big-picture question about the procurement budget and about the Navy budget in general. I think it is – it has been said

that the Navy's requirements to meet its goal for shipbuilding is on the order of about $20 billion a year against which you are now getting only about 15, I think. So what is the answer to that? And then, in sort of a larger – from a larger perspective, are we spending enough as a nation on the U.S. defense budget? And what would you like to see happen with regard to that?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: I think when you talk about how much we require each year; I think it is important to look in kind of the near-term shipbuilding and then the longer-term shipbuilding. And right now the 15 billion in the near term – you know, we can make that work. And I think the ultimate question, it comes down to what sort of a navy does the nation want? And that is something that we have developed our maritime strategy and continue our conversations with the country. We just had one at Duke University here last week – or this week, I'm sorry.

You know, I think that is the fundamental question. Do we consider ourselves to be a maritime nation? And what is it that maritime nations need to be viable and be prosperous? That is the question. What we have laid out is our proposal for the type of navy that we need. And we have a process through which we work. And ultimately, that is the decision that the nation has to make.

MR. CLARK: You haven't mentioned – in response to that question – the argument, if you will, made by some in the Defense Department and outside the Defense Department that the nation ought to be spending a certain fixed percentage of the GDP – 4 percent is what people are talking about. And that is 4 percent with combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, in addition to that. Is that 4-percent figure – how does that sit with you and the Joint Chiefs? And is that gaining any traction as you see it in arguments around town – Congress and so on?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: I think, you know, the 4-percent figure, I believe, is a good reference point to use. But I would also say that there will be times where, you know, it may need to be more than 4 percent, that there will be other drivers and to simply lock in on 4 percent is, perhaps, not the best way to do it, but to use that as a benchmark around which to assess is the nation spending what it needs to on defense.

So I think the 4 percent is good as a reference point, but I don't – I really don't come down that it is 4 percent, forever will be 4 percent regardless of what the domestic circumstances are or what the international circumstances are.

MR. CLARK: Let me ask you – turn to one question on hotspots around the country. And then, James is – turn it over to James again. Before I do that, I think it is worth nothing that on the current path, the defense budget would be down around 3.2 percent or something like that, right? We are talking about increasing the path of the defense budget.

Hotspots – let's talk for a minute about Russia, Georgia, Black Sea, Navy involvement with that. And I would like, if you are willing, for you to bring us up-to-

date on what is happening in the Black Sea. There was controversy in the wake of the Russian invasion of Georgia about the balance of naval power there. And for example, we said we would test Russia by offloading humanitarian supplies in the port of Poti, then decided to use the port of Batumi to the south.

Ukraine threatened to increase the fees Russia pays for using the port of Sebastia (sp), Poland – Crimea. In Moscow, the Russian officials said the buildup of NATO vessels in the Black Sea violated the Montreux Convention of 1936. And there was a close proximity of the NATO ships and Russian ships during that period while Georgian action was hot and heavy. I don't know whether that is still true. But what is the Navy doing there now? And how is it interacting with, you know, other NATO allies and the Russians in the Black Sea?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Well, we have – and have for a long time – been operating ships in the Black Sea in accordance with the Montreux Convention. There are certain limits on – (inaudible) – and what have you. And we have operated in there, as I said, routinely. In the aftermath of the conflict in Georgia, we did send a ship – or ships into the Black Sea with humanitarian assistance. There were Russian ships operating in that area. There was nothing that I would characterize as either aggressive or irresponsible behavior on the part of the Russian ships.

As many of you may recall, during the Cold War, we had in place with the Soviet Union an incident-at-sea agreement. Those still provide some good guidelines on how to operate and there were no issues with regard to how we operated the ship – the first ship that went into Poti was one of our combatants, the McFall – able to go in by itself because it does have that integrated air and missile defense capability that I talked about. So we were very comfortable with McFall.

We have a ship that is operating in the Black Sea as part of a standing NATO group that as part of their routine operations had gone up in there. So we are in and out of the Black Sea. The six-fleet command ship also made a transit into the Black Sea and will continue to operate up there. But I think what you are also going to see with the Russian navy is a navy that is, again, kind of finding itself, getting its sea legs back and will start operating a bit more beyond its normal operating areas in the northern reaches around its country.

And, I mean, this is not something that came post-Georgia. I had the opportunity to spend time with my counterpart from about a year ago when I was in Norfolk. And it was clear to me at that point that the petroleum money was flowing, that the Navy was getting resources again, that the generation of senior leaders in the Russian navy look back to the Soviet days as kind of the heyday. They – at least in talking with them, there were no allusions that the size and reach of the Russian fleet would immediately go back to the Soviet days.

But the stirrings of wanting to be out and about were there. We are now seeing that. And I believe in the coming years, you are going to see the Russian navy out and

about episodically, not in large numbers. But they know where they want to go and they will be going that way.

MR. KITFIELD: It raises an interesting question because one thing that was not in the maritime strategy was sort of the old conventional threats that we got used to thinking about during the Cold War – Russia and China. I don't think China was even mentioned. And I understand that you were looking ahead at the world as you perceived it.

But now we are seeing the Old Russian bear, you know, turn the same face to us that we saw during the Cold War. Russia is selling pretty advanced subs to China. And China is still building up a lot of forces – missile, as well as submarine around the Taiwan straits. Do you think that that makes an argument for paying a little more attention to the Navy? Give me your sense of whether you think we are backing – the conventional threat has not gone away totally here. And I think a lot people in this time of counterinsurgency have lost sight of it a little bit. But talk about that.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Well, the only country that is mentioned in the maritime strategy is the United States. And what we avoided in the maritime strategy is looking and saying, okay, you know, it is this country or that country or this country, but rather to talk about the capabilities that we believe we need as a maritime nation. And that is what we are about.

When you talk about the sea control power projection, it really does get to looking at the capabilities that are developing around the world and what must we have to be able to counter those capabilities. The term that I use is – you know, when I look at capabilities, I am normally not looking at flags. And the reason being is because, you know, Hezbollah doesn't really have a flag. But yet, they have capabilities.

So it is about where do we want to be as a nation? What do we believe we must be able to do on the world's oceans because I think you are going to have to deal with opposing capabilities that you can't always peg. If you get into the areas of, for example, submarine development – clearly, China's fleet is growing in capability and capacity. There is no question about that.

But when you look at submarine developments of the future – in the next 20 years, the submarine population of the world is going to increase 50 percent. And that is not our number that is driving that. There are submarines that are proliferating – and I don't say that in a negative sense. It is just that there are companies that are building submarines. Nations realize that submarines are great disruptors to maritime commerce. Submarines, in my mind, also tend to be – they are kind of the coin of the realm, that when you have a submarine, you are kind of – you have arrived. And submarines really can make a difference.

If you go back to the Falklands War, where there was one submarine in the Argentine navy, questionable capability as to whether it could get underway. The royal

navy put 150 torpedoes in the water because they didn't know. And you begin to see phantoms – and anti-submarine warfare is very, very hard because you are dealing in an environment where it is not like having a radar that you can see an airplane hundreds of miles away. Submarines can hide in ocean currents and eddies. Sound behaves in very different ways. And that is why for us, training in that environment is very, very important.

MR. KITFIELD: You talked about Asia being, you know, sort of the epicenter of trade – I know a lot of people think that is where the game is shifting in a lot of ways from the Atlantic to Asia. So talk for a second about China. You know, only a few years ago, Secretary Rumsfeld was raising the flag about lack of transparency in their military modernization. And a lot of experts I have talked to believe that they were very specifically focusing that modernization through submarines and on all these missiles lined up against the straits to make it difficult for you to come to the aid of Taiwan if it came to an intimidation sort of scenario like we saw in '96. Is that your understanding that they are still full speed ahead on that? Are we concerned about a shift of relative power – naval power in Asia? Give me your thoughts on China.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Having –

MR. KITFIELD: And I know you don't want to be provocative and say, oh, China is an enemy. (Inaudible) – talking, again, about capabilities, not intentions.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Yeah, no, and I have had the opportunity over the last – greater than a decade to have some fairly unique insights into the PLA navy that I treasure very much. Starting back in the early '90s for a variety of reasons, I had opportunity to spend time with some of the senior leadership. And particularly in my role in the Pacific, I had been able to spend time with my counterpart and to spend time in China. And in fact, I was in China when the first U.S. Navy ship moored at a PLA navy operational base.

So when you talk about the transparency, obviously, very important. There has been progress, I think, and there has been some forward motion in that. Clearly, we would like to have greater transparency. We would like to be able to do more with the PLA navy in terms of, you know, some basic exercises, so that we can develop at the operational level some relationships with them. There is no question that the PLA navy is growing in capability and capacity, and that Taiwan is always going to be very foremost in their mind. But what I have seen in the past few years is the indications and the alignment, if you will, of their fleet structure and their base structure that is really beginning to put their navy more in the traditional role of a navy that is there to ensure the flows on the seas and guarantee the flows of resources, so that it will continue to fuel their economy.

MR. KITFIELD: Okay, good.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: And so you are beginning to see a navy that starts to look more toward the sea lanes of communication, a navy that has ambitions to extend its regional reach, to be a navy that can influence events. And that is, to me, where their navy is going. Will Taiwan always be front and center? Yes. But they are viewing their navy much the same way as I believe we do.

MR. KITFIELD: Traditional.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: We exist to ensure the safety, security and prosperity of the nation. And that is how I think I see them evolving.

MR. KITFIELD: If I could touch on one more hotspot. I mean, when you talk about your ability to, you know, project an umbrella to air defense, as well as keep shipping lines open, I think automatically of the straits of Hormuz in Iraq. They had some very provocative actions a year or so ago with the British ships that they took the sailors captive. They have swarmed some of our ships as a way, I think, of testing our reactions, et cetera. Talk a little bit about Iranian capabilities and what you perceive is their intentions. Are they still being as provocative? And can we keep the straits of Hormuz open if it came to that?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Yeah. With regard to Iran, you know, they, in my opinion, see the gulf as their gulf, and that they have put in place some naval capabilities that can be problematic. There is no question about that. Do I have confidence in our ability to assure the flows and the sea lanes? I do. You know, we have been operating in the gulf for 60 years – over 60 years. And so I have confidence there.

I also am encouraged by the coalition activity that is taking place there. And that, too, is part of our maritime strategy that the term, cooperative, on the cover is not coincidental. And you know, for the first time in history, this past year, an Arab navy led a maritime task force when Brigadier General Mansoori, the chief of the Bahraini navy, led Task Force 152. That says something about our cooperative approach. It says something about the desire for nations to work together. But I also think it speaks volumes about the Gulf States and their desire to be part of a maritime force that exists for peaceful and prosperity reasons in the gulf.

MR. CLARK: Just to follow up on that a little bit, you have actually emphasized in some of your speeches and in the strategy, too, the idea that partnerships are more important than ever. In the gulf, you just talked about the Bahraini leadership of that task force, but wouldn't it be true to say that we still have really the lead role in the gulf? Let me pause down. I have another thought.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Well, there is no question that we have predominant combat power in the gulf.

MR. CLARK: So you said that quote, "all our capabilities are made much more powerful by the partnerships in which we are engaged," unquote. You have talked about

the president's landing of the French Rafale fighters on the decks of one of our carriers and mentioned partnerships with Bahrain, Canada, Spain, very specific nations.

And so two questions – one, our diplomatic relations with some of these countries have been greatly strained in recent years. And I am wondering if we see this, as a nation, as a way of repairing and strengthening some of those relationships. And secondly, our Navy is much smaller than it used to be, so we are really quite dependent, are we not, on these partnerships to really project force and to do the work we need to do as free nations of the world around the world.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Well, as you pointed out, the partnership dimension is significant not just because we can increase our capacity and capability, but working together, I believe, you can become a much more convincing and, in some instances, a compelling force when you work closely together.

The other thing that it has done and a line that has often been quoted out of our strategy is that much of what we are doing is building trust among navies and nations because we believe that trust can't be surged, that there is no switch for trust. You can't say I need trust today, and you turn a light and everyone trusts. It is like even a personal relationship builds over time. It can be lost in an instant, but it takes time to build. And so by working together – and we learn a lot, particularly when we operate in areas of the world that are new to us, when we operate with other forces, for example.

You know, my French counterpart is here this week. And we have worked very closely with them in and around Africa because they have a historic relationship with many of the countries there. And they understand and they have access in places where we do not have. And by working with them, we learned it puts us in contact with other countries. So that, we believe, is part of our future.

MR. CLARK: Let me see.

MR. KITFIELD: Can I just follow up on that –

MR. CLARK: Yeah, please.

MR. KITFIELD: – because one of the partnerships that is described in the maritime strategy, I think, makes excellent sense and I wonder why we haven't done it before is between the Navy and the Coast Guard. You know, as someone who has covered Southern Command, one of the few commands you haven't actually commanded, you know, you see that in the counterdrug mission where our navies and navies of allies like France and Holland work side by side with Coast Guard cutters and others. Talk for a second about that as being a force multiplier because it seems like a no-brainer to me, but it hasn't really been done that much in the past.

There was a cultural break – firewall there, it seems to me.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Well, you know, to me, I mean, the cooperative aspect applies inside, as well. In fact, Thad Allen and I just had breakfast yesterday. And it always makes your staff nervous when you go off and you have breakfast together.

MR. KITFIELD: Don't give away the family jewels. (Chuckles.)

ADM. ROUGHEAD: That is right. Don't give away the jewels. But, you know, we clearly have been. And one of the areas where I think we are making just tremendous progress is in the area of maritime security because that has been – you know, the Coast Guard really does that, does it very well. And as we expand and work maritime-security issues around the world, having the Coast Guard involved in that is extremely important.

How do you work with the Coast Guard, particularly in support of their homeland-security mission and take, for example, some of the information that we may have? And how do we fuse it together? How can we – and Thad and I have talked about this – how do we, for example, take advantage of some common systems? For the first time last week, my communications staff, if you will, my command control staff sat down with his and said, how do we make sure that we are on a common path and that the information systems that we are using are on a common roadmap because we can't afford to be stovepipe there, in the air.

Thad and I have also been talking about can we come up with some ways in which – where we have common unmanned aerial vehicles? Can we perhaps base those together? And oh, by the way, save a little bit of money in the process. So I think you are going to continue to see that relationship with the Coast Guard continue to grow.

MR. KITFIELD: It makes a lot of sense, too, when you are talking about being overseas and some of these non-state actors out there, where the Coast Guard has sort of law-enforcement authorities that are a little bit different from yours. And they can – because I have talked to Thad, and he says, well, we have a lot of these battle groups have Coast Guard ships attached to them, so they can interact with these small navies in Africa, for instance, that really are more like our Coast Guard than our Navy.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: And I would be remiss if I didn't mention that it was a Coast Guard ship that also took humanitarian aid into Georgia. It was one of the ships that went in there.

MR. KITFIELD: When we talk about the budget and the reappearance of sort of more conventional threats, was there a sense to you – and this is really sort of a personnel issue of how you send a message to the Navy that it is still relevant that these – because clearly, a lot of people like me who have been focused in the last few years on Iraq and Afghanistan, places where you don't see a whole lot of Navy people. And I am just curious whether you have to combat a feeling that they are not getting the attention they deserve.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Not at all. And the reason you don't see a lot of Navy people in Iraq and Afghanistan is they wear camouflage.

(Laughter.)

No, I mean, seriously. They were wearing their camies – is what I still call them. But in Iraq and Afghanistan, there are 15,000 Navy sailors on the ground. There are more Navy sailors serving in the sand than at sea in the Middle East. And they are doing unbelievable work. They are clearly connected to our Marine Corps, as they always have been. And the corpsmen have still, you know, probably one of the most respected people in the squad.

We have a large contingent of intelligence people there. The Navy is running the detainee operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. We have construction battalions that are in Iraq and Afghanistan. We have had the lead in going after radio controlled improvised explosive devices because we in the Navy have a particular skill of being able to exist in electromagnetic environments where we can deny it to others and use it for ourselves.

We are the service that, I believe, has that competency and we have made some great progress there. So 15,000 sailors on the ground doing unbelievable –

MR. KITFIELD: Obviously, SEALs, too.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: SEALs, EOD, so, you know, our presence in there. And it is valued by the commanders and it is valued by the individuals that go. In addition to which, in Iraq, over 50 percent of the fixed-wing air sorties are flown by naval aviation. In Afghanistan, over 40 percent of the fixed-wing air is coming off the deck of our carrier that is operating south of Afghanistan in the Indian Ocean.

And so as I have gone around and I have talked to our sailors, there is a tremendous sense of purpose, a tremendous commitment to the mission wherever it may be. I just did an around-the-world swing spending most of the time in Iraq and Afghanistan talking to our sailors there because when you deploy sailors individually, there is a whole different set of support structures and a whole different set of training protocols that have to be put in place. And I wanted to go out and walk the ground and talk to them and make sure that we are getting this right and that when you deploy individually, your families don't have that traditional Navy home guard, if you will.

So how do you make sure you are properly taking care of your families when you are deployed in ones and twos and threes? So as I went around, I visited the sailors on the ground. Tremendous satisfaction. As I mentioned, the air support that we are providing. Visited a small mine countermeasure ship in the gulf. And when you talk to the young sailors that were showing me how they did their work, I mean, they believed – they honestly believed that they were keeping that sea lane open. And they were proud of that fact. So everywhere I go, there is a great sense of self-worth and our people are doing great things.

MR. KITFIELD: Great.

MR. CLARK: We would like to open the microphones to questions from you in the audience. There are two mikes – one there and one there. And if you would like to ask a question or make a comment, please just stand up and we will recognize you at one of these mikes.

Let me ask a question of you, Admiral Roughead, while we are waiting for questions from the audience. As I understand, the maritime strategy has two new emphases – one is maritime security, the other is humanitarian assistance and disaster response. Could you talk a little bit more about the humanitarian assistance and disaster response function and how that is being organized and whether you have, you know, ships in cruise and new systems to support that activity, and whether the resources are there to do what, I think, is probably a fairly expensive new mission for the Navy.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Well, I mentioned kind of the genesis of how we got into humanitarian assistance following the tsunami. We capitalized on sailing the hospital ship, Mercy, within 10 months because we had formed such a bond with the NGOs and with the other countries that my view was if we didn't move quickly, we would kind of go back to where we came from and life would be the same.

So we pulled together and we scraped together some money and we sailed Mercy into Southeast Asia. Eleven NGOs agreed to go onboard the ship. And we had six countries that contributed medical personnel to go on the ship. Four-and-a-half months – and they served 67,000 patients in Indonesia, the Philippines, Bangladesh. And then we said, okay, what, you know, what is the follow on to that? And we then took a large amphibious ship where we could put construction equipment on it. And the next year, again with NGOs now sailing on a gray Navy ship, which – you know, seven years ago had you asked me if NGOs would be on Navy ships, I would have said no. They are there and they do great work. And they are great partners.

But then, at that time, Jim Stavridis down in SOUTHCOM said, you know, I would like to do a hospital ship down into South America. And it became apparent to me that we needed to lay in some funding. So I committed that we would apportion a certain part of our budget for proactive humanitarian assistance for a couple reasons. One, we needed to get the predictability into it because you can tell the United States Navy you need to be in Haiti in almost in a couple of days, we will be there. We will figure it out. But when you are dealing with NGOs who are volunteer dependent, when you are dealing with other nations who perhaps have some other budgetary rules and restrictions, you need to give them that predictability.

So we have started now to schedule out and we do a hospital ship every year – one west, one east. And then, when we are not doing that, we do a large amphibious ship. We have also added the Africa Partnership Station, which works in West Africa. We just completed one with the Fort McHenry and the Nashville – one of our large

amphibious ships is getting ready to go again. Again, it pulls other countries, NGOs onboard. It teaches. It treats. Mercy just finished another Southeast Asian mission – 90,000 patients.

And when you look back from the first Mercy mission that we did, the number of patients that we have seen, the number of operations that have been performed on our ships exceeds Johns Hopkins in that same period of time – only we do it with volunteers and we do it on something that moves. And that is huge. And it has made a difference. And the other thing that it has done for our young sailors is they get an incredible sense of satisfaction from doing this. They learn about other cultures. And they realize that we live in a pretty darn good country.

MR. CLARK: Terrific. We have a question here. Yes, sir?

Q: Good morning, Admiral.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Good morning.

Q: I am John Warren with the Naval Air Systems Command at Pax River. You have mentioned a number of things that are going after a limited Navy budget. Given that we have all experienced rising fuel costs, and you have got ships and aircraft to operate, have you got some strategy for dealing with that ever-increasing piece of the budget that has to go just for fuels?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Thanks for bringing that up. You know, fuel, not only hits our sailors' pocketbooks, it hits ours, as well. When you see an increase of a dollar on a barrel – when I see an increase on a dollar on a barrel – 33 million go off in my mind because that is what it equates to for our Navy today. And how we operate the Navy, how efficiently we operate it is something that we pay attention to.

A couple of years ago, we employed what we call the enterprise construct, where we now are much, much more aware of how much it really costs us to generate the type of readiness that we need – not just in air, but in also our ship fleet. We are moving forward and looking at new types of, for example, hull coatings that can be employed. And even though the individual ship savings don't seem like a lot when you start adding them together, they make a difference. In our shore installations, we are moving. And we have the lead within DOD on geothermal, where we have gotten to the point, for example, in China Lake and soon to be in Fallon, where we are actually providing power to the grid. We, in places like Hawaii, are going solar and generating a lot of our solar energy for our shore installations – still nowhere near where it needs to be, but at least we are moving out in that regard.

Guantanamo Bay – we have a wind farm there. We are using that. But what I have asked our naval sea systems commander and the officer in charge of our shore infrastructure – as I said, we have got to start looking at how do we bring our fuel usage

down on the fleet in being and when we look to the future, where do we go to get savings in the future?

MR. CLARK: We have a question here, but a quick follow up. Are you reducing steaming time at all because –?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: No. We are steaming more than we have in the past, largely driven by operations.

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir?

Q: Good morning, Admiral. I am Ernest Nicholson (sp) from CDEXO. Good to see you and I actually served under you at East Timor. We had a question about your current – if you could give us a current update on the move of the Marines from Okinawa down to Guam. And then, as a separate question, if you could speak a bit about the cooperation that you guys are working on with the Army Corps of Engineers and other intraservice agencies in the infrastructure build out for sub-Saharan Africa from Mombasa to the West Africa stationing and the like, as you are going forward into the Africa of tomorrow with its move from humanitarian assistance to actual commerce and commerce links.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Yeah, I think the move to Guam for the Marines and also for the Navy – and we don't have a – excuse me – a significant footprint shift for the Navy. But I really do believe that in the future, Guam is going to be of increasing strategic importance for us. Our allies in the Western Pacific are terrific and they give us great support. Example, today, the USS George Washington, the first nuclear-powered warship to be forward deployed in Japan arrives today much through the support of our Japanese allies.

But I think that Guam will become important for the standpoint of providing a place from which to operate in the Western Pacific for years, indeed, decades to come. So as the Marines build out their presence for the Navy, we are looking at the design of the harbor and how do we support their needs, and also the ability to put a carrier in there from time to time – not home port, but I call it a hub – that a carrier can go in, and stop in, and recharge and get back out on the line again.

With regard to Africa, to date, our approach has been really in the build out – the infrastructure build out. Our construction battalions are there doing work. But, you know, we have had a significant input – or impact, I would say, with our Africa Partnership Station, some of the things that we are doing there. We are the only component – by component, I mean service – Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine – that we have structured ourselves, so that the Navy commander for Africa is a four star, which adds, I think, a lot of credibility to that officer and the staff as we go down and work some of the projects down in Africa.

But we are there and we look forward to working with AFRICOM on their strategy for Africa.

MR. KITFIELD: Any luck in getting the piracy off the coast of Somalia under control? You see so much of it recently.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Yeah, it really has spiked in recent weeks. I want to say this morning, we are at 13 pirated ships that are there. It really is – the solution has to be multifaceted. You know, I maintain pirates don't live at sea. They only go there to do their work. They live ashore, so you have to be able to have the governance and then the capability and capacity to do something there.

We have created some maritime patrol security areas – or maritime security patrol areas and countries have participated in those. We know we have disrupted some acts, but the ransoms are being paid. It is a very lucrative business, and it is a big ocean out there.

MR. CLARK: When you say that 13 pirated ships – that means – what is a pirated ship? What does that mean?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: That they are in the custody of pirates and ransom –

MR. CLARK: They have been taken over? They have been taken over by pirates really? Amazing. Yes, we have a question here.

Q: Good morning, sir. John Tabler (ph) with CA. Sir, to provide operational capability and capacity to reduce cost, would you discuss your governance processes to optimize the acquisition of the logistics chain?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: To optimize the logistics chain?

Q: The acquisition of the logistics chain – in other wise, to get the capacity and capability to the fleet to meet readiness goals. Can you talk about some of your –

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Well, I think the – you know, the thing that really sets us apart as a global navy is really our ability to provide the global logistics that are associated with supporting that navy. You know, we have worked very, very closely with our defense agencies to ensure that we can do that. We have worked very hard in the past few years to bring down the port costs as we send ships in and looking at different contracting vehicles, so that we can bundle and perhaps get better rates as we put some of our ships into foreign ports, which is not an inexpensive proposition in the case of – particularly an aircraft carrier, you are talking millions of dollars to go in on a visit.

So – and I don't think I am getting to your answer, but that is the way that we are going forward.

MR. KITFIELD: You mentioned that one of our efficiencies was going to be smaller crews. How are you going to get at that because that always has been sort of a holy grail – you want to get the manpower down on the ships and –

ADM. ROUGHEAD: And I think we are making good progress in the case of, for example, LCS, down to 40 people. They are a busy 40 people. There is no question about it. They are also probably, pound for pound, the most talented sailors that we have because they have to perform a variety of roles and functions, and their level of knowledge has to be very high. Relying on technology is important. A lot of it, quite frankly, are cultural, you know, breakthroughs that we have to make. I mean, when I was a fleet commander in the Atlantic, you go aboard a ship and see some automated system. And then, you know, there is the sailor dutifully writing down all of the – (laughter) – same information. And, you know, why are we doing this? And so getting through that.

And then, also, as you go down to the smaller crews, having in place some other structures and other support mechanisms, so that when the ships do come into port, you are able to do some of the facilities maintenance and some of the deeper preservation – that when you have basically an operating crew, you just can't get to. And we have to have that in place. Otherwise, we are going to shorten the life of that ship because it will decay.

MR. CLARK: Are you able to – how are you able to achieve smaller crews on the existing fleet?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Well, one of the things that we do is to be able to go in and put more automated systems in, for example, automated recordkeeping, off boarding some of the support functions that you would normally have, and that you can have a smaller unit ashore supporting more ships. So those are the things that we are pursuing and will pay off.

MR. CLARK: We have a question here.

Q: Admiral, thank you for your remarks. You talked very clearly about the strategy that you have laid out for the Navy and maritime domain. The question I have is, are there gaps that you think industry partners should be stepping up more to help you fill?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: You know, I think – and I am not just saying this to take advantage of the last question, but I think in areas of manpower, savings are absolutely key because I don't think I am saying anything new to this audience that the costs of people are huge. And so how do we put in place systems that allow us to reduce the number of people that we have to have on our ships. So I think to me, that is an area.

And that also spins off into how do you build ships and airplanes that require the least amount of maintenance per operational hour? And that can come in a variety of

forms. And, you know, longer mean time between failures, new coatings, particularly in a maritime environment that can be so harsh. So those are areas that I think we really have to make a push, and it gets into the people piece.

MR. CLARK: Let's take one more question from the floor. And then, we are going to start to wrap this up. Yes, ma'am?

Q: Thank you. Paula Thebault (ph), General Services Administration. We are getting ready to embark upon embracing Lean Six Sigma within GSA. It has already been done at the Federal Acquisition Service, but we are trying to do it throughout GSA. I know the Navy and the Defense Department have done this quite a bit. What are your experiences, if you have had any, with Lean Six Sigma? And is it a success?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Yeah, no, I think that it has made a huge difference in our ability to become more efficient, to really streamline a lot of our processes, and then from that, reduce some of the costs. And I would encourage you to get with the folks and we can – I have someone here that can get some contact information to you. And I offer our experience that we have had to you and your colleagues because it really has permeated in so many areas. You know, I think people thought well, it is all going to be about some manufacturing process. But we are applying it to everything.

For example, one of the things that is important to our people is, you know, due recognition. We have many, many sailors who are doing heroic and extraordinary things in Iraq and Afghanistan. They need to be rewarded quickly. So we did a Lean Six Sigma project on how quickly can you move an award for an individual through the bureaucracy. And we have made significant changes there. So it can be applied in many areas – medical areas. You know, when we were producing the mine-resistant vehicles. How can we get those out faster? Lean Six Sigma.

If you want to go down and see an incredible operation down in Charleston where the vehicles come in, and then they are kind of what I call tricked up to be ready to go out and get into the fight. The gains that have been made because of Lean Six Sigma are extraordinary.

Q: Fantastic. I'll catch you afterwards, then, perhaps.

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Pam will take care of you.

MR. CLARK: James, do you have a last question?

MR. KITFIELD: No, I'm good.

MR. CLARK: Well, let me then ask you, Admiral Roughead, what question we haven't asked or what – would you like to say a few final words?

ADM. ROUGHEAD: No, I would just like to thank you for your time and for your questions and for your interest in your Navy. And come back around to what we talked about earlier – I think, you know, we, at the end of the day, really are a maritime nation. We have been and geography will continue to insist that we will remain one. So the value of the Navy, how the Navy is seen is something that, I believe, we need to talk about more often and more broadly. And I appreciate your support in that regard. Thank you.

MR. CLARK: Thank you very much for being with us. Please join me in giving –

(Applause.)

ADM. ROUGHEAD: Thank you very much. That was great. That was really great.

MR. KITFIELD: Thanks a lot. That was very interesting. Nice to meet you, Admiral.

(END)